arXiv:0812.0962v3 [math.CO] 1 Apr 2010

Final version of the paper (GCOM-D-09-00021) accepted by Graphs and Combin.

SYMMETRIC IDENTITIES FOR EULER POLYNOMIALS

YONG ZHANG, ZHI-WEI SUN AND HAO PAN

Abstract. In this paper we establish two symmetric identities on sums of products of Euler polynomials.

1. Introduction

The Bernoulli numbers $B_0, B_1, B_2, \ldots$ are rational numbers given by

$$B_0 = 1, \text{ and } \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n+1}{k} B_k = 0 \text{ for } n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots.$$

The Euler numbers $E_0, E_1, E_2, \ldots$ are integers determined by

$$E_0 = 1, \text{ and } \sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ 2\mid n-k}}^{n} \binom{n}{k} E_k = 0 \text{ for } n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots.$$

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. The Bernoulli polynomials $B_n(x)$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ and the Euler polynomials $E_n(x)$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ are defined by

$$B_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} B_k x^{n-k} \text{ and } E_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \frac{E_k}{2^k} \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-k}.$$

It is well known that

$$\Delta(B_n(x)) = nx^{n-1} \text{ and } \Delta^*(E_n(x)) = 2x^n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where we set

$$\Delta(P(x)) = P(x+1) - P(x) \text{ and } \Delta^*(P(x)) = P(x+1) + P(x)$$

for any polynomial $P(x)$. Bernoulli and Euler numbers and polynomials play important roles in many fields including number theory and combinatorics.

In 2006 Z. W. Sun and H. Pan [6] established the following theorem which unifies many curious identities concerning Bernoulli and Euler numbers and polynomials.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05A19; Secondary 11B68.

The second author is responsible for communications, and supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (grant 10871087) and the Overseas Cooperation Fund (grant 10928101) of China.

Theorem 1.1 (Sun and Pan, 2006)**.** *Let n be a positive integer and let $x+y+z=1$.*

(i) *If r,s,t are complex numbers with $r+s+t=n$, then we have the symmetric relation*

$$r\begin{bmatrix} s & t \\ x & y \end{bmatrix}_n + s\begin{bmatrix} t & r \\ y & z \end{bmatrix}_n + t\begin{bmatrix} r & s \\ z & x \end{bmatrix}_n = 0$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} s & t \\ x & y \end{bmatrix}_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\binom{s}{k}\binom{t}{n-k}B_{n-k}(x)B_k(y).$$

(ii) *If $r+s+t=n-1$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{r}{2}\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}(-1)^l\binom{s}{l}\binom{t}{n-1-l}E_l(y)E_{n-1-l}(x)\\
=\;& \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\binom{r}{k}\binom{s}{n-k}B_k(x)E_{n-k}(z)\\
&-(-1)^n\sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\binom{r}{k}\binom{t}{n-k}B_k(y)E_{n-k}(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Recently, by a sophisticated application of the generating function method, A. M. Fu, H. Pan and F. Zhang [2] extended Theorem 1.1(i) of Sun and Pan to an identity on sums of products of $m \geq 2$ Bernoulli polynomials.

In this paper we obtain a general identity only involving Euler polynomials and also give an extension of Theorem 1.1(ii) which involves both Bernoulli and Euler polynomials.

Theorem 1.2. *Let m and n be positive integers, and let $r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m$ be complex numbers with $r_0+r_1+\cdots+r_m=n-1$.*

(i) *If m is odd, then we have the symmetric relation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m\geq 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j)\\
&=-\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\geq 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_i}E_{k_i}(1-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1\leq j\leq m\\ j\neq i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_i+\mathbf{1}_{j>i}), \qquad (1.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{j>i}$ takes 1 or 0 according as $j>i$ or not.

(ii) *If m is even, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{r_0}{2}\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n-1}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j)\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_i}B_{k_i}(1-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_i+\mathbf{1}_{j>i}).\end{aligned}\qquad(1.2)$$

Remark 1.1. If $r+s+t=n-1$, then (1.2) in the case $m=2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{r}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\binom{s}{k}E_k(1-y)\binom{t}{n-1-k}E_{n-1-k}(x)\\ =&-\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{r}{k}B_k(1-(1-y))\binom{t}{n-k}E_{n-k}(x-(1-y)+1)\\ &+\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{r}{k}B_k(1-x)\binom{s}{n-k}E_{n-k}((1-y)-x)\\ =&-(-1)^n\sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\binom{t}{n-k}E_{n-k}(1-x-y)\binom{r}{k}B_k(y)\\ &+\sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k\binom{r}{k}B_k(x)\binom{s}{n-k}E_{n-k}(1-x-y),\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the identity of Sun and Pan in Theorem 1.1(ii) since $E_k(1-x)=(-1)^kE_k(x)$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 given in the next section involves the difference operator Δ and its companion operator Δ^*. We can also show Theorem 1.2 via the generating function approach.

Let k be any nonnegative integer. It is well known that $B_k=0$ if k is odd and greater than one. By [1, pp. 804-808],

$$B_k\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)=(2^{1-k}-1)B_k\ \text{ and }\ E_k(x)=\frac{2}{k+1}\left(B_{k+1}(x)-2^{k+1}B_{k+1}\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\right).$$

Thus

$$(-1)^kE_k(1)=E_k(0)=2(1-2^{k+1})\frac{B_{k+1}}{k+1}.$$

In view of these, Theorem 1.2 in the case $x_1=\cdots=x_m=1/2$ yields the following consequence involving Euler numbers and Bernoulli numbers.

Corollary 1.1. *Let m and n be positive integers, and let $r_0,r_1,\ldots,r_m$ be complex numbers with $r_0+r_1+\cdots+r_m=n-1$.*

(i) *If m is odd, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&(-1)^n\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\prod_{j=1}^m\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^m(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}(-1)^{|\{i<j\le m:\ k_j>0\}|}\binom{r_0}{k_i}E_{k_i}\prod_{\substack{1\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}\tilde{B}_{k_j+1},\end{aligned}\tag{1.3}$$

where $\tilde{B}_k=2^k(2^k-1)B_k/k$ for $k=1,2,3,\ldots$.

(ii) *If m is even, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&(-1)^nr_0\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n-1}}\prod_{j=1}^m\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^m(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}(-1)^{|\{i<j\le m:\ k_j>0\}|}\binom{r_0}{k_i}(2^{k_i}-2)B_{k_i}\prod_{\substack{1\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}\tilde{B}_{k_j+1}.\end{aligned}\tag{1.4}$$

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

As usual we let $\mathbb{C}$ denote the field of complex numbers. By [4, Lemma 3.1], for $P(x),Q(x)\in\mathbb{C}[x]$, we have $P(x)=Q(x)$ if $\Delta^*(P(x))=\Delta^*(Q(x))$. This property will play a central role in our proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $P_1(x),\cdots,P_m(x)\in\mathbb{C}[x]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&P_1(x)\sum_{1<i\le m}(-1)^i\Delta^*(P_i(x))\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\ j\ne i}}P_j(x+\mathbf{1}_{j<i})\\ =&\begin{cases}\Delta^*(P_1(x)\cdots P_m(x))-\Delta^*(P_1(x))P_2(x+1)\cdots P_m(x+1) & \text{if } 2\nmid m,\\ \Delta^*(P_1(x)\cdots P_m(x))-\Delta(P_1(x))P_2(x+1)\cdots P_m(x+1) & \text{if } 2\mid m.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{1<i\le m}(-1)^i\Delta^*(P_i(x))\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\ j\ne i}}P_j(x+\mathbf{1}_{j<i})\\ =&\sum_{1<i\le m}\left((-1)^i\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x+\mathbf{1}_{j<i})-(-1)^{i+1}\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x+\mathbf{1}_{j<i+1})\right)\\ =&(-1)^2\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x)-(-1)^{m+1}\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x+1).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_1(x)\sum_{1<i\le m}(-1)^i\Delta^*(P_i(x))\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\ j\ne i}}P_j(x+\mathbf{1}_{j<i})\\
=&P_1(x)\cdots P_m(x)+(-1)^mP_1(x)\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x)\\
=&\Delta^*(P_1(x)\cdots P_m(x))-(P_1(x+1)+(-1)^{m-1}P_1(x))\prod_{1<j\le m}P_j(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the desired identity. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $a_0,\bar a_0,a_1,\bar a_1\dots,a_n,\bar a_n$ be complex numbers, and set*

$$A_k(t)=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}(-1)^la_lt^{k-l}\quad and\quad \bar A_k(t)=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}(-1)^l\bar a_lt^{k-l}$$

for $k=0,\dots,n$. Let $r_0+r_1+\cdots+r_m=n-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\dots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}(-x_1)^{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}A_{k_j}(x_j-x_1)\\
=&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\dots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_1}{k_1}{x_1}^{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}A_{k_j}(x_j). \qquad (2.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Also, for any $i=2,\dots,m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\dots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}A_{k_1}(-x_1)\binom{r_i}{k_i}(x_i-x_1)^{k_i}\prod_{\substack{2\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}\bar A_{k_j}(x_j-x_1)\\
=&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\dots,k_m\ge0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_1}{k_1}(x_1-x_i)^{k_1}\binom{r_0}{k_i}A_{k_i}(-x_i)\prod_{\substack{2\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}\bar A_{k_j}(x_j-x_i). \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Remark 1.1 of Sun [5],

$$A_k(x+y)=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}x^{k-l}A_l(y)\ \text{ and }\ \bar A_k(x+y)=\sum_{l=0}^{k}\binom{k}{l}x^{k-l}\bar A_l(y)$$

for every $k=0,\ldots,n$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge0\\k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}(-x_1)^{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^m\binom{r_j}{k_j}A_{k_j}(x_j-x_1)\\=&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge0\\k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}(-x_1)^{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^m\binom{r_j}{k_j}\sum_{l_j=0}^{k_j}\binom{k_j}{l_j}(-x_1)^{k_j-l_j}A_{l_j}(x_j)\\=&\sum_{\substack{l_1,\ldots,l_m\ge0\\l_1+\cdots+l_m=n}}(-x_1)^{l_1}\prod_{j=2}^m\binom{r_j}{l_j}A_{l_j}(x_j)\sum_{\substack{k_1\ge0,\ k_j\ge l_j\ (1<j\le m)\\k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^m\binom{r_j-l_j}{k_j-l_j}.\end{aligned}$$

Given $l_1,\ldots,l_m\in\mathbb{N}$ with $l_1+\cdots+l_m=n$, by the Chu-Vandermonde convolution identity (cf. [3, (5.22)]), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{k_1\ge0,\,k_j\ge l_j\ (1<j\le m)\\k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}\prod_{j=2}^m\binom{r_j-l_j}{k_j-l_j}\\=&\binom{r_0+(r_2-l_2)+\cdots+(r_m-l_m)}{n-l_2-\cdots-l_m}=\binom{l_1-1-r_1}{l_1}=(-1)^{l_1}\binom{r_1}{l_1}.\end{aligned}$$

So (2.1) follows.

(2.2) can be proved similarly. Let Σ denote the left-hand side of (2.2). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma=&\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge0\\k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}\sum_{l_i=0}^{k_1}\binom{k_1}{l_i}(x_i-x_1)^{k_1-l_i}A_{l_i}(-x_i)\binom{r_i}{k_i}(x_i-x_1)^{k_i}\\&\times\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}\sum_{l_j=0}^{k_j}\binom{k_j}{l_j}(x_i-x_1)^{k_j-l_j}\bar{A}_{l_j}(x_j-x_i)\\=&\sum_{\substack{l_1,\ldots,l_m\ge0\\l_1+\cdots+l_m=n}}(x_i-x_1)^{l_1}\binom{r_0}{l_i}A_{l_i}(-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{l_j}\bar{A}_{l_j}(x_j-x_i)\\&\times\sum_{\substack{k_j\ge l_j\ (1\le j\le m\ \&\ j\ne i)\\k_i\ge0,\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0-l_i}{k_1-l_i}\binom{r_i}{k_i}\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\j\ne i}}\binom{r_j-l_j}{k_j-l_j}\\=&\sum_{\substack{l_1,\ldots,l_m\ge0\\l_1+\cdots+l_m=n}}(x_i-x_1)^{l_1}\binom{r_0}{l_i}A_{l_i}(-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{l_j}\bar{A}_{l_j}(x_j-x_i)\times(-1)^{l_1}\binom{r_1}{l_1}.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

Remark 2.1. If we set $a_l = (-1)^l B_l$ and $\bar{a}_l = (-1)^l E_l(0)$ for $l = 0, \ldots, n$ in Lemma 2.2, then $A_k(t) = B_k(t)$ and $\bar{A}_k(t) = E_k(t)$ for any $k = 0, \ldots, n$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We fix $x_2, \ldots, x_m$.

(i) Suppose that m is odd. Set

$$P(x_1) = \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \geqq 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_0}{k_1} E_{k_1}(1-x_1) \prod_{j=2}^{m} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j - x_1 + 1).$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta^*(P(x_1)) \\
=&\sum_{i=2}^{m}(-1)^i \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \geqq 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_0}{k_1} E_{k_1}(1-x_1) \binom{r_i}{k_i} 2(x_i - x_1)^{k_i} \prod_{\substack{2 \le j \le m \\ j \ne i}} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j - x_1 + \mathbf{1}_{j>i}) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \geqq 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_0}{k_1} 2(-x_1)^{k_1} \prod_{j=2}^{m} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j - x_1).
\end{aligned}$$

With the help of Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta^*(P(x_1)) \\
=&2\sum_{i=2}^{m}(-1)^i \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \geqq 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_1}{k_1} (x_1 - x_i)^{k_1} \binom{r_0}{k_i} E_{k_i}(1-x_i) \prod_{\substack{2 \le j \le m \\ j \ne i}} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j - x_i + \mathbf{1}_{j>i}) \\
&+ 2 \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \geqq 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_1}{k_1} x_1^{k_1} \prod_{j=2}^{m} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\Delta^*(P(x_1)) = \Delta^*(Q(x_1))$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(x_1) = &\sum_{1<i\le m} (-1)^i \sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m \ge 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \binom{r_0}{k_i} E_{k_i}(1-x_i) \prod_{\substack{1 \le j \le m \\ j \ne i}} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j - x_i + \mathbf{1}_{j>i}) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m \ge 0 \\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \binom{r_j}{k_j} E_{k_j}(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $P(x_1) = Q(x_1)$ by [4, Lemma 3.1]. This proves (1.1).

(ii) Now assume that m is even. Define

$$P(x_1)=\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\geqq 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}B_{k_1}(1-x_1)\prod_{j=2}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_1+1).$$

For $k_1=0,1,2,\ldots$, clearly

$$\binom{r_0}{k_1}(B_{k_1}(1-(x_1+1))-B_{k_1}(1-x_1))=-\binom{r_0}{k_1}k_1(-x_1)^{k_1-1}=-r_0\binom{r_0-1}{k_1-1}(-x_1)^{k_1-1}.$$

(As usual $\binom{x}{-1}$ is regarded as 0.) Thus, by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta^*(P(x_1))\\ =&2\sum_{i=2}^{m}(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_1}B_{k_1}(1-x_1)\binom{r_i}{k_i}(x_i-x_1)^{k_i}\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_1+\mathbf{1}_{j>i})\\ &-r_0\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n-1}}\binom{r_0-1}{k_1}(-x_1)^{k_1}\prod_{1<j\le m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_1).\end{aligned}$$

With the help of Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta^*(P(x_1))\\ =&2\sum_{i=2}^{m}(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_1}{k_1}(x_1-x_i)^{k_1}\binom{r_0}{k_i}B_{k_i}(1-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1<j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_i+\mathbf{1}_{j>i})\\ &-r_0\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n-1}}\binom{r_1}{k_1}x_1^{k_1}\prod_{1<j\le m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j).\end{aligned}$$

So we have $\Delta^*(P(x_1))=\Delta^*(Q(x_1))$, where

$$\begin{aligned}Q(x_1)=&\sum_{i=2}^{m}(-1)^i\sum_{\substack{k_1,\ldots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n}}\binom{r_0}{k_i}B_{k_i}(1-x_i)\prod_{\substack{1\le j\le m\\ j\ne i}}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j-x_i+\mathbf{1}_{j>i})\\ &-\frac{r_0}{2}\sum_{\substack{k_1,\cdots,k_m\ge 0\\ k_1+\cdots+k_m=n-1}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\binom{r_j}{k_j}E_{k_j}(x_j).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $P(x_1)$ coincides with $Q(x_1)$ by [4, Lemma 3.1]. So (1.2) holds. This concludes the proof. □

Acknowledgment. We thank the two referees for their helpful comments.

References

[1] Abramowitz, M., Stegun, I.A. (eds.): Handbook of Mathematical Functions. Dover Publications, New York (1972)

[2] Fu, A.M., Pan, H., Zhang, I.F.: Symmetric identities on Bernoulli polynomials. J. Number Theory **129**, 2696–2701 (2009)

[3] Graham, R.L., Knuth, D.E., Patashnik, O.: Concrete Mathematics, 2nd ed., Addison-Wesley, New York (1994)

[4] Pan, H., Sun, Z.W.: New identities involving Bernoulli and Euler polynomials. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **113**, 156–175 (2006)

[5] Sun, Z.W.: Combinatorial identities in dual sequences. European J. Combin. **24**, 709–718 (2003)

[6] Sun, Z.W., Pan, H.: Identities concerning Bernoulli and Euler polynomials. Acta Arith. **125**, 21-39 (2006)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210093, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

E-mail addresses: `yongzhang1982@163.com, zwsun@nju.edu.cn, haopan79@yahoo.com.cn`